REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application.

Allowable Claims

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 4-12, 16-24 and 28-36 are allowed.

Claims 1-3, 13-15 and 25-27 over Microsoft

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 13-15 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by *Microsoft Windows CE Toolkit for Visual Basic 6.0 Guidebook Tour* to Microsoft ("Microsoft"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-3, 13-15 and 25-27 recite an application program comprising compiled program scripts and non-compiled screen definitions. The run-time engine is recited to create screen definitions from the non-compiled screen definitions at run-time as if the screen definitions had been defined at compile time.

The Office Action alleged that Okuda discloses receiving at least one application program in a handheld mobile wireless client device through disclosure of an application named "Project1" created with Visual Basic (see Office Action, page 3).

Mocrosoft appears to disclose an application named "Project1" created with Visual Basic. However, Microsoft's "Project1" is not disclosed as anything but a conventionally compiled application, and thus includes compiled screen definitions. In contrast, Applicants' application program is recited as comprising compiled program scripts and non-compiled screen definitions, as recited by claims 1-3, 13-15 and 25-27.

Thus, Microsoft requires compiled screen definitions since the application can only be run under the Windows CE run time engine. By using non-compiled screen definitions, the runtime engine can interpret the definitions for the application enabling a single definition of the User Interface to run across

multiple variants of a runtime engine, such as J2ME, that tend to be more device specific.

As Applicants explain their disclosure, conventional compiling of screen definitions creates an overly large file size for a resultant application. This overly large file size can become a problem for a device that has limited storage capabilities, such as a pager. However, to overcome such deficiencies associated with limited storage devices, the claims recite <u>non-compiled screen definitions</u>. The Applicants disclose that such non-compiled screen definitions result in a reduction in an application program size that is received by a handheld mobile wireless client device.

Moreover, since Microsoft fails to teach use of <u>non-compiled screen definitions</u>, Microsoft fails to teach a run-time engine that is recited to create screen definitions <u>from the non-compiled screen definitions</u> with an application program at run-time as if the screen definitions had been defined at compile time, as recited by claims 1-3, 13-15 and 25-27.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 13 and 25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df